

RECEIVED

ALLTEL Corporate Services, Inc. 655 15th Street N.W. • Sulte 220 • Washington, DC 20005 Telephone: 202-783-3970 • Facsimile: 202-783-3982

'APR 23.1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

April 22, 1996

Mr. William F. Caton Acting Secretary Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, NW, Room 222 Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re:

Revision of Filing Requirements

CC Docket No. 96-23

Dear Mr. Caton:

Attached please find an original and 6 copies of ALLTEL's Reply Comments in connection with the above-referenced matter.

If you have any questions or need any additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Carolyn C. Hill

Counsel for ALLTEL

Caroly Hell

Telephone Services Corporation

CCH/ss

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd

RECEIVED

Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

APR 23.1996

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

In the Matter of)	DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
Revision of Filing Requirements)	CC Docket No. 96-23

REPLY COMMENTS

ALLTEL Telephone Services Corporation, on behalf of its affiliated local exchange companies (hereinafter "ALLTEL" or the "ALLTEL Companies"), respectfully submits its reply comments in response to the comments filed on April 8, 1996, in the above-captioned proceeding.

Comments were filed by fourteen parties, including ALLTEL, in response to the Commission's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. ("NPRM") The comments supported the Commission's proposed elimination of thirteen common carrier reporting requirements and the reduction of the frequency of complying with six other reporting requirements. The filers endorsed the Commission's commitment to regulatory streamlining and reform and encouraged the adoption of further streamlining measures to reduce the regulatory burdens on LECs. Many of the filers had specific proposals. For example, Cincinnati Bell Telephone Company ("Cincinnati Bell") urged the Commission to increase the revenue threshold for filing cost allocation manuals ("CAMs") and other reports, to change the Part 32 "materiality" rules to conform to generally accepted accounting principles, ("GAAP") and to eliminate some redundant or unnecessary reports; e.g., the 495A and B reports and the ARMIS reports 43-05-07.

(Cincinnati Bell comments pgs. 1-4) ALLTEL endorses these proposals.

As pointed out by Cincinnati Bell, the current \$100 million threshold for filing CAMs and ARMIS reports could be increased to \$1 billion in the current environment without comprising the Commission's ability to obtain necessary information. Id. at p2. ALLTEL agrees with this assessment. Moreover, it should be noted that the revenue threshold for filing CAMs and ARMIS reports was developed in the 1985-1987 time frame when divestiture had only recently taken place and the monopoly franchise existed. Since that time, the \$100 million revenue threshold for filing CAMs and ARMIS reports has not changed, but the environment in which ALLTEL and other LECs operate has dramatically changed with the passage of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 ("96 Act") and the recent merger announcements of various large LECs.

With the Administration's commitment to eliminating or reducing unnecessary reporting through its Reinventing Government initiatives, as well as the Commission's attendant responsibilities in the 96 Act to implement regulatory reform, ALLTEL submits that the Commission should continue to move forward expeditiously with its positive efforts. These efforts should recognize the changes that have taken place in the industry and the marketplace. One responsive recognition of these changes would be to increase the revenue threshold for filing CAMs and ARMIS reports to \$1 billion dollars as suggested by Cincinnati Bell. Another threshold, equally as responsive, is the mid-size LEC standard established by the 96 Act. That standard creates a distinction between LECs with under two (2) percent of the nation's access lines and LECS of greater size.

CONCLUSION

In summary, ALLTEL supports the Commission's proposals set forth in the NPRM, together with the revisions and modifications set forth in ALLTEL's earlier comments. Moreover, ALLTEL believes that the adoption of the proposals set forth by Cincinnati Bell in its comments as well as the adoption of the two (2) percent standard for filing proposed herein by ALLTEL will serve the public interest.

Respectfully submitted, ALLTEL Telephone Services Corporation

By: Carolyn C. Hill

655 15th Street, N.W., Suite 220

Washington, DC 20005

(202) 783-3974

Its Attorney

April 22, 1996

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Sondra T. Spottswood, hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing "Reply Comments

" was served this 22 day of April, 1996, by United States mail, first-class service, postage

prepaid, unless otherwise noted, upon the following:

James U. Troup, Esquire
L. Charles Keller, Esquire
Attorneys for Iowa Network Services, Inc.
Arter & Hadden
1801 K Street, N.W, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006

Gail L. Polivy, Esquire Attorney for GTE Service Corporation 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 1200 Washington, DC 20036

Jay C. Keithley, Esquire Leon M. Kestenbaum, Esquire Attorneys for Sprint Corporation 1850 M Street, N.W. Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20036-5807

William J. Balcerski, Esquire Attorney for NYNEX Telephone Companies 1111 Weschester Avenue White Plains, New York 10604

Danny E. Adams, Esquire
Edward A. Yorkgitis, Jr., Esquire
The Competitive Telecommunications Association
Kelley Drye & Warren
1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20036

Richard McKenna, Esquire Attorney for GTE Service Corporation P.O. Box 152092 Irving, Texas 75015-2092

Joanne Salvatore Bochis, Esquire
Attorney for National Exchange Carrier
Association, Inc.
100 South Jefferson Road
Whippany, New Jersey 07981

Diane R. Stafford, Esquire Attorney for Sprint Corporation P.O. Box 11315 Kansas City, MO 64112

Genevieve Morelli, Esquire
Vice President and General Counsel
The Competitive Telecommunications
Association
1140 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 220
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mary McDermott, Esquire
Linda Kent, Esquire
Charles D. Casson, Esquire
Attorneys for United Telephone Assoc.
1401 H Street, NW., Suite 600
Washington, DC 20005

Porter E. Childers, Executive Director Legal & Regulatory Affairs United Telephone Association 1401 H Street, N.W., Suite 600 Washington, DC 20005

Gregory L. Cannon, Esquire
Attorney for U S West Communications, Inc.
1020 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036

Lucille M. Mates, Esquire Attorney for Pacific Bell and Nevada Bell 140 New Montgomery Street, Room 1526 San Francisco, California 94105

Robert M. Lynch, Esquire
Durward D. Dupre, Esquire
Jonathan W. Royston, Esquire
Attorneys for Southwestern Bell Telephone Company
One Bell Center, Suite 3520
St. Louis, Missouri 63101

Regina Keeney (by hand) Chief, Common Carrier Bureau Federal Communications Commission 1919 M Street, N.W., Room 500 Washington, DC 20554

Nasir Khilji (by hand)
Industry Analysis Division
Common Carrier Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
2033 M Street, N.W., Room 500F
Washington, DC 20554

Timothy Fain
OMB Desk Officer
10236 NEOB
725-17th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20503

Lawrence W. Katz, Esquire Attorney for The Bell Atlantic Telephone Companies 1320 North Court House Road Eighth Floor Arlington, Virginia 22201

M. Robert Sutherland, Esquire
A. Kirven Gilbert, III, Esquire
Attorneys for BellSouth Corporation
and BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc.
1155 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 1700
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3610

Margaret E. Garber, Esquire Attorney for Pacific Bell and Nevada Bell 1275 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20004

Thomas E. Taylor, Esquire
David S. Bence, Esquire
Attorneys for Cincinnati Bell
Telephone Company
2500 PNC Center
201 East Fifth Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-5715

International Transcription Services (by hand)
2100 M Street, N.W., Room 140
Washington, DC 20037

Dorothy Conway (by hand)
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 234
Washington, DC 20554

ondra T. Spottswood